

A3

NEW YORK TIMES
11 July 1985

House Acts to Allow Angola Rebel Aid

By JONATHAN FUERBRINGER

Special to The New York Times

WASHINGTON, July 10 — The House of Representatives voted tonight to repeal the ban on United States military aid to the guerrillas fighting the Marxist Government of Angola. The vote was 236 to 185 on an amendment to the foreign aid authorization bill.

The Senate has approved a similar repeal, which means it is likely that the ban, first approved in 1976, will be repealed this year. But the Senate repeal was attached to a different piece of legislation, the State Department authorization act, and it is possible that the entire foreign aid authorization bill will not be approved in the House.

In the House vote, 176 Republicans were joined by 60 Democrats in favor of repeal; 179 Democrats and 6 Republicans opposed repeal.

The vote, which is a major reversal, reflects a growing sentiment in the House for aiding groups that are fighting Communist and other leftist governments. On Tuesday, the House approved \$5 million in aid to the non-Communist rebels fighting the Vietnamese-controlled Government of Cambodia. The House has also approved aid to the insurgents in Afghanistan and nonmilitary aid to Nicaraguan rebels.

The amendment approved today was proposed by Representatives Samuel S. Stratton of New York and Claude Pepper of Florida, both Democrats. It only removes the ban it does not provide any financing for military aid.

Those supporting the amendment said it would show that the United States opposed Communism in Africa and, as Mr. Pepper said, had "not washed our hands of Angola. Those people in Africa have the right to be free." The Reagan Administration supports repeal.

Opponents argued that repealing the ban would indicate support for the apartheid policy of South Africa, against which the House has approved economic sanctions. In addition, they argued, it would imply support of the South African Government's military actions in South-West Africa and Angola.

'Majority Rule' Seen as Issue

"The issue in southern Africa is not Communist expansion, it's majority rule," said Representative William H. Gray 3d, Democrat of Pennsylvania. He said repealing the ban, known as the Clark Amendment after former Senator Dick Clark of Iowa, would "support the continued suppression of the majority there."

The so-called Clark Amendment had banned aid to the pro-Western National Union for the Total Independence of Angola, which is led by Jonas Savimbi.

The vote came as the House continued work on the \$12.6 billion foreign aid authorization bill. At the same time, the Senate began today to consider a bill imposing sanctions on the South Af-

rican Government. It was being blocked from moving to approval, however, by opposition led by Senator Jesse Helms, Republican of North Carolina.

Measures on Family Planning

Earlier today, the House approved two amendments to the foreign aid bill that restrict funding for family planning. One allows the cutoff of funds to international organizations if abortion is promoted by the family planning programs these organizations support. The second amendment, which is aimed at China, allows the cutoff of funding for the United Nations Fund for Populations Activities, if it provides direct or indirect assistance to countries that officially permit forced abortion.

After the Senate voted 88 to 8 to block a filibuster on the motion to begin debate on the South African bill, Senator Helms indicated that he might extend the debate by reading a history of South Africa.

The bill would apply economic sanctions against South Africa, banning new bank loans, the sale of computers to agencies like the police that enforce the policy of apartheid, and the sale of goods used in nuclear production. The bill would also require American companies of 25 or more employees to follow the so-called Sullivan principles, which mandate equal treatment of blacks in jobs and housing.

Senator Alan Cranston, Democrat of California, in denouncing Senator Helms's delaying tactics, said:

"If the Senator from North Carolina had been in the Senate 122 years ago, he probably would have opposed Emancipation because it would have thrown four million slaves out of work."